

REMARKS

The Examiner contends that Applicant did not fully respond to the prior Office Action since there was no response to the double patenting rejection. Applicant disagrees. In lieu of filing a Terminal Disclaimer, Applicant argued the double patenting rejection as improper on page 6 of the May 26, 2009 Amendment. That argument is presented again below for the Examiner's convenience.

Claims 14-19 and 22-24 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 13-19 and 22-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,799,733. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner contends that the "currently claimed invention is broader than the '733 claims". As a result of the above amendments, Applicant submits that the current claims are not broader than the claims of the '733 patent since the current claims recite straight passages between the surface and the fuel outlet with the passages having ends that intersect to form a common seat exit passage at the fuel outlet and thus these claims are patentably distinct from the claims of the '733 patent. Therefore, the double patenting rejection should be withdrawn.

Thus, Applicant submits that the Amendment filed on May 26, 2009 fully responded to the prior Office Action. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward J. Stemberger
Registration No. 36,017
Tel. No. (202) 261-1014

Date: October 27, 2009

Customer No. 24500